



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,491	01/16/2004	Stephane DeLisle		6183

7590 03/10/2006  
Stephane DeLisle  
1518 Montee Sauvage  
Prevost, QC JORITO  
CANADA

EXAMINER

SCHARICH, MARC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3611

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/758,491

Applicant(s)

DELISLE, STEPHANE

Examiner

Marc A. Scharich

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application filed in Canada on 1/13/2003. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter, therefore, the foreign priority date claimed is not considered by the examiner.

### *Specification*

2. The title of the invention contains the following informalities: the word "vehicule" is spelled incorrectly in the English language. The examiner suggests changing the spelling to the appropriate English word "vehicle".

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of improper English language, including English spelling and English grammar. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Additionally, it is recommended by the examiner to correct misspelled words such as "vehicule", "propulse", "manoeuvre", "replacable", and "layed" to "vehicle", "propel", "maneuver", "replaceable", and "laid" respectively in the abstract.

The Examiner also suggests that all other areas of the Specification, including BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION, SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS, and DETAILED DESCRIPTION contain proper English language and grammar. Any words such as "vehicule" should be changed to the correct English spelling "vehicle".

The use of the trademark "Caterpillar" has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to by the Examiner. An acceptable "Figure 1" has not been received. It is advised that the applicant send an acceptable replacement drawing for "Figure 1". If the previous "Figure 1" is no longer desired by the applicant to be present in the application, the previous "Figure 2" and "Figure 3" should be renamed "Figure 1" and "Figure 2" respectively. If the applicant elects to rename the drawings, the BRIEF and DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS must be modified to appropriately reference the renamed drawings.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form due to being a multiple dependent claim that is dependent on claim 1 and claim 2. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claim 3 has not been further treated on the merits.

Additionally, the CLAIMS section must begin and end on a page that is separate from any other sections in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, and 3 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. Additionally, the claims fail to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3611

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karales, U.S. Patent No. 6,615,939. Referring to Figure 1, Karales discloses a track conversion that converts an All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) into a vehicle with a track drive in order to operate over such surface conditions as snow or mud. Column 3, lines 4-9 state, "Referring to FIG. 1, an ATV vehicle (10) is shown in outline, equipped with a track conversion (12) which incorporates the original rear wheels (14) with the tires. Since this conversion may be intended for when the ATV is used in the snow, the front wheels (16) may be replaced with skis (18) as are used with snowmobiles." Karales fails to specifically disclose, however, that the ATV is a size of 4X6. It is well known, however, that various ATV's and related small utility vehicles may be built to various sizes for different uses, including a size of 4X6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a track drive conversion on a 4X6 sized utility vehicle in order to give the 4X6 sized utility vehicle improved capabilities on such surface conditions as snow or mud.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A. Scharich whose telephone number is (571) 272-3244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.A.S 3/1/2006



LESLEY D. MORRIS  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600